arXiv:1303.4829v1 [gr-qc] 20 Mar 2013

# Thermodynamics of Quantum Isolated Horizon in Canonical Ensemble

Abhishek Majhi
Astro-Particle Physics and Cosmology Division
Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics
Kolkata-700064, India

March 21, 2013

## Abstract

The derivation of the microcanonical entropy of a Quantum Isolated Horizon(QIH), directly from the associated quantum Chern-Simons(CS) theory, in terms of the two parameters characterizing the QIH, namely the level of the associated CS theory($k$) and the total number of punctures of the QIH($N$), is reviewed. With a view to extend the thermodynamic analysis to the Canonical Ensemble a model energy spectrum for the QIH is proposed from a complete quantum view point using the available elements of Loop Quantum Gravity(LQG). The study of thermodynamics of QIH in the Canonical Ensemble reveals that, in the LQG framework, for a quantum spacetime admitting a thermodynamically stable QIH as its internal boundary, must have a specific bound on the Barbero-Immirzi(BI) parameter if the entropy of the QIH obeys the Bekenstein-Hawking Area Law. To mention, the complete analysis, especially the used energy spectrum of the QIH, has been performed from a complete quantum viewpoint.

# Contents

**1 Introduction** **3**

**2 The Physical States of the QIH** **4**

**3 Microcanonical Entropy and the parameters of QIH** **5**

**4 A Model Energy Spectrum for the QIH** **8**

**5 A Model Hamiltonian for the QIH** **11**

**6 Canonical Ensemble** **13**

6.1 Single Puncture Energy Spectrum as a power law . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15

6.2 A Specific Case : $E_j \propto A_j$ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 18

6.3 Revisiting the Complete Energy Spectrum . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 18

**7 Discussion** **20**

# 1 Introduction

The classical Isolated Horizon(IH) is a null inner boundary of spacetime, foliated by 2-spheres, with specific local properties consistent with General Theory of Relativity and is a generalization of the teleological concept of event horizons to more realistic and dynamical situations that are expected to occur in Nature [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. The quantization of IH phase space [6, 7] in the Loop Quantum Gravity(LQG) framework provides the topology of Quantum Isolated Horizon(QIH), at a particular time slice, to be that of 2-sphere punctured by the spin network describing the bulk quantum geometry. The QIH degrees of freedom belong to the Hilbert space of an SU(2) Chern-Simons theory coupled to the punctures, acting as sources. Recently it has been shown [8, 9] that the microcanonical entropy of a QIH can be completely written in terms of the two parameters, $k$ and $N$, which fully characterizes the QIH, applying standard statistical mechanical methods and using the knowledge of the physical degrees of freedom of the QIH belonging to the Hilbert space of the Chern-Simons theory. To mention, $k$ is the level of the Chern-Simons theory and $N$ is the total number of punctures on the QIH. It has been also shown that the Barbero-Immirzi parameter($\gamma$) [10, 11, 12, 13] must be bounded within a certain range of values for the Bekenstein-Hawking area law(BHAL)[14] to be valid. Amazingly, the ambiguous parameter $\gamma$, which is present also in the bulk quantum theory, gets determined by the parameters characterizing the boundary i.e. the QIH [8]. However, by studying a system in the microcanonical ensemble we only get a statistical viewpoint. The true thermodynamic analysis of a system begins only in the canonical or grand canonical ensemble. Hence, to get a taste about the thermodynamics of a QIH, the aim of this paper will be to investigate the Canonical Ensemble scenario.

To make the paper self-contained, at first, in section (2) we shall shed some light on the quantum geometric description of a spacetime admitting an Isolated Horizon as an internal null boundary and the corresponding Hilbert space of the QIH. Following this, in section(3), we shall make a brief review of the derivation of the microcanonical entropy shown in [8] and [9], along with the proper identification of the two independent parameters characterizing the QIH. Before going on to the canonical ensemble, having no knowledge of quantized energy spectrum of a QIH, in section(4), we construct a model energy spectrum from the available elements related to the area operator in LQG framework. To be specific, the energy contribution from a single puncture is written as a power series in the area contribution from a single puncture. Now, in section(6), we construct the canonical partition function for a spacetime admitting a QIH as its inner boundary by the thermal holographic approach introduced in [15] and generalized for the grand canonical ensemble in [16]. In section(6.1) and section(6.3), using the model energy spectrum as the spectrum of the Hamiltonian of the QIH, the thermodynamic analysis is carried out. Firstly, in section(6.1) a simplified model of the energy spectrum is studied where the single puncture energy contribution is related to the single puncture area contribution by a *power law* only. Then, in section(6.3), the full energy spectrum is revisited. The specific heat is calculated from the canonical partition function for all these cases which reveals interesting consequences as far as the one parameter($\gamma$) ambiguity is concerned. Finally, in section (7), we end with some concluding remarks on this extensive thermodynamic analysis of QIHs in the canonical ensemble whereby we also provide the physical explanation for the upper bound on the Barbero-Immirzi parameter obtained in [8] and consequently argue that this upper bound is *universal*.

## 2 The Physical States of the QIH

The Hilbert space of a quantum spacetime admitting QIH as an inner boundary is given by $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_V \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ modulo gauge transformations, where $V$ denotes bulk and $S$ denotes boundary(QIH) at a particular time slice[6, 7]. Mathematically, if the 4d spacetime $(\mathbf{R} \otimes \Sigma)$ admits a 3d IH $(\Delta)$ as null inner boundary, then $S \equiv \Delta \cap \Sigma$ denotes a cross-section of the IH [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]. Hence, a generic quantum state of the spatial geometry of such a spacetime can be written as $|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi_V\rangle \otimes |\Psi_S\rangle$, where $|\Psi_V\rangle$ is the wave function[1] corresponding to the volume($V$) or bulk states represented by an oriented graph, say $\Gamma$, consisting of edges and vertices [17] and $|\Psi_S\rangle$ denotes a generic quantum state of the QIH. $|\Psi_S\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_S \equiv$ the Hilbert space of the CS theory coupled to the punctures $\{\mathcal{P}\}$ made by the bulk spin network $\Gamma$ with the IH endowing them with the spin representations carried by the respective piercing edges which are solely responsible for all the relevant features of the QIH, the most important being the quantum area spectrum of the QIH. To be precise, for a given $N$ number of punctures, with spins $(j_1, \cdots, j_N)$, the QIH Hilbert space is given by $\mathcal{H}_S \equiv \mathrm{Inv}(\otimes_{i=1}^N \mathcal{H}_{j_i})$ where 'Inv' denotes the invariance under the local $SU(2)$ gauge transformations on the QIH. Now, as it is seen that at the quantum level the full Hilbert space is the direct product space of the bulk and boundary Hilbert spaces, a generic quantum state of the QIH (boundary) can be written in terms of basis states on $\mathcal{H}_S$, independent of the bulk wave function. Hence, one should understand that a basis state of the QIH Hilbert space is actually coupled with a generic quantum state of the bulk Hilbert space i.e. that is a linear combination of the basis states of the bulk geometry. In other words, a given *spin configuration* on the QIH admit all possible graphs ($\Gamma$-s) in the bulk consistent with the given configuration. This spin configurations provide the area eigenstate basis, which is the all important material in the context of QIH entropy. Such a basis state of the QIH Hilbert space is denoted by the ket $|\{s_j\}\rangle$. This is an eigenstate of the area operator associated with the QIH, having the area eigenvalue given by $\hat{A}_S|\{s_j\}\rangle = 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_{j=1/2}^{k/2} s_j \sqrt{j(j+1)}|\{s_j\}\rangle$. Such a spin configuration (eigenstate) has a $(N!/\prod_j s_j!)$-fold degeneracy due to the possible arrangement of the spins yielding the same area eigenvalue. Hence, a generic quantum state of the QIH can be written as

$$|\Psi_S\rangle = \sum_{\{s_j\}} c[\{s_j\}]|\,\{s_j\}\rangle$$

where $|c[\{s_j\}]|^2 = \omega[\{s_j\}]$(say) is the probability that the QIH is found in the state $|\,\{s_j\}\rangle$. Hence, a generic quantum state of the spacetime, admitting QIH as an inner boundary, may now be written as $|\Psi\rangle \equiv |\Psi_V\rangle \otimes \sum_{\{s_j\}} c[\{s_j\}]|\,\{s_j\}\rangle$.

---

[1] Strictly speaking, these are actually *functionals* of the $SU(2)$ spatial connection variables and a smooth *function* of generalized gauge-invariant connections, the holonomies along the edges of the oriented graph [17], popularly known as the spin network.

The computation of the microcanonical entropy formula of Kaul and Majumdar [19] proceeds from the expression for the number of conformal blocks of $SU(2)_k$ WZW model on a 2-sphere with marked points (punctures) carrying spin which, in the seminal work of Witten [18], has been shown to give the dimensionality of the $SU(2)$ singlet part of the Hilbert space of CS states on $\mathbf{R} \otimes S^2$ coupled to punctures on the $S^2$. Using this remarkable connection, the fusion algebra and the Verlinde formula, the degeneracy of the microstates is expressed as [19]

$$\Omega(j_1, \cdots, j_N) = \frac{2}{k+2} \sum_{a=1}^{k+1} \frac{\sin \frac{a\pi(2j_1+1)}{k+2} \cdots \sin \frac{a\pi(2j_N+1)}{k+2}}{\left(\sin \frac{a\pi}{k+2}\right)^{N-2}} \tag{1}$$

which can be alternatively recast as a linear combination of Kronecker deltas [19], explicitly manifesting the singlet nature of the physical states :

$$\Omega(j_1, \cdots, j_N) \;=\; \sum_{m_1=-j_1}^{j_1} \cdots \sum_{m_N=-j_N}^{j_N} \left[ \delta_{\left(\sum_{p=1}^{N} m_p\right),0} - \frac{1}{2}\, \delta_{\left(\sum_{p=1}^{N} m_p\right),1} - \frac{1}{2}\, \delta_{\left(\sum_{p=1}^{N} m_p\right),-1} \right]$$

For the calculations we shall use the expression (1). To obtain the total number of conformal blocks, this expression must be summed over all possible spin values at each puncture.

$$\Omega(N,k) = \sum_{j_1, \cdots, j_N} \Omega(j_1, \cdots, j_N) \tag{2}$$

Now, since we shall apply the method of most probable distribution to find the microcanonical entropy of the QIH, it is convenient to recast eq.(2) as sum over spin-configurations, i.e., the number of punctures carrying a specific spin $j$, for all possible values of $j$, becomes the dynamical variable. Using multinomial expansion it is straightforward to rewrite eq.(2) in the following desired form[9]

$$\Omega(N,k) = \sum_{\{s_j\}} \Omega[\{s_j\}] = \sum_{\{s_j\}} \frac{N!}{\prod_j s_j!} g[\{s_j\}] \tag{3}$$

where $j$ runs from $1/2$ to $k/2$ as usual and

$$g[\{s_j\}] = \frac{2}{k+2} \sum_{a=1}^{k+1} \sin^2 \frac{a\pi}{k+2} \prod_j \left\{ \frac{\sin \frac{a\pi(2j+1)}{k+2}}{\sin \frac{a\pi}{k+2}} \right\}^{s_j} \tag{4}$$

The combinatorial factor in eq.(3) reflects the *statistical* distinguishablity of the punctures, a property inherited by the punctures in the quantization procedure of the classical IH due to the nontrivial holonomies of the Chern-Simons connection on the IH along disjoint closed loops about the punctures[7].

## 3 Microcanonical Entropy and the parameters of QIH

Having identified the two parameters which characterize the macrostates of a QIH, it is an immediate consequence that we can define a microcanonical ensemble of QIHs for fixed preassigned values of $k$ and $N$. Of course this is somewhat different form the usual notion of microcanonical ensemble where the total energy of a system is fixed. But, if we think carefully, every macroscopic physical quantity associated with the QIH must be a function of $k$ and $N$. It is expected that fixing $k$ and $N$ will definitely fix the total energy of the QIH, if one can formulate an energy spectrum for a QIH. Moreover, as far as the microcanonical entropy of a QIH is concerned, it is more like a statistical entropy rather than a thermodynamic one. So it is really not so important to care about the definition of energy in this context which becomes rather vital in the canonical or grand canonical ensemble where the system is allowed to interact with the environment and the Hamiltonian gets involved at the moment we write down the partition function. This particular issue will be discussed in detail at a later stage in the context of the definition of canonical ensemble.

As far as the microcanonical ensemble is concerned, fixing the values of $k$ and $N$ is tantamount to imposing two constraints on the system. It can be explained as follows. The area eigenvalue equation for a particular eigenstate of the QIH can be written as

$$\hat{A}|\{s_j\}\rangle = 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_j s_j C_j \, |\{s_j\}\rangle \tag{5}$$

where we have written $\sqrt{j(j+1)} = C_j$ for convenience. Hence, the expectation value of the area operator for the QIH is given by

$$\langle\hat{A}\rangle = \langle\Psi|\hat{A}|\Psi\rangle \;=\; 8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \sum_{\{s_j\}} \omega[\{s_j\}] \sum_j s_j C_j \;=\; A_{cl} \pm \mathscr{O}(\ell_p^2) \tag{6}$$

where $A_{cl}$ is the area of the classical IH closely represented by the QIH. Scaling the equation by $8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2$ and using $\langle\hat{A}\rangle/8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \simeq A_{cl}/8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 = k/2$ [7, 29], we obtain

$$\sum_{\{s_j\}} \omega[\{s_j\}] \sum_j s_j C_j = \frac{k}{2} \tag{7}$$

Again, the expectation value of the number of punctures on the QIH is given by

$$\langle\hat{N}\rangle = \langle\Psi|\hat{N}|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{\{s_j\}} \omega[\{s_j\}] \sum_j s_j \;=\; N \tag{8}$$

where $\hat{N}$ can be considered as the operator for the number of punctures for a QIH. One should note that unlike the case of area the expectation value of $\hat{N}$ is *exactly* equal to the total number of punctures $N$. Since, we are applying equilibrium statistical mechanics, in accord with the basic postulates, we assume that one of the configurations will contribute the maximum i.e. the system remains most of the time in that particular state designated by the most probable configuration $\{s_j^\star\}$(say) [28]. Mathematically this is equivalent to writing $\omega[\{s_j^\star\}] \simeq 1$. Hence, each spin configuration must obey the following two constraints

$$\mathcal{C}_1 : \sum_j s_j = N \tag{9a}$$

$$\mathcal{C}_2 : \sum_j s_j C_j = \frac{k}{2} \tag{9b}$$

Thus, definition of a microcanonical ensemble of QIHs by assigning fixed values of $k$ and $N$, has imposed two constraints given by the eqs.(9). So, the microcanonical entropy of the QIH is written as

$$S_{MC} = \log \Omega(N,k) \simeq \log \Omega[\{s_j^\star\}] \tag{10}$$

which can be calculated by using the method of most probable distribution. Variation of $\log \Omega[\{s_j\}]$ with respect to $s_j$, subject to the constraints $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$, yields the distribution function $s_j^\star$ for the most probable configuration $\{s_j^\star\}$ which maximizes the entropy of the QIH. It comes out to be

$$s_j^\star = N \exp\left[-\lambda C_j - \sigma + \frac{\delta}{\delta s_j} \log g[\{s_j\}]\right] \tag{11}$$

Here, we shall consider only first order approximation while calculating $g[\{s_j\}]$ from eq.(4), which yields

$$g[\{s_j\}] \simeq \frac{2C}{\pi} \prod_j (2j+1)^{s_j} \tag{12}$$

where $C$ is some positive constant, which in turn gives us the spin distribution for the dominant configuration as

$$s_j^\star = N(2j+1) \exp\left[-\lambda C_j - \sigma\right] \tag{13}$$

Now, using eq.(13) in eq.(10) and applying Stirling approximation considering the limits $s_j^\star \to \infty, N \to \infty$, a straightforward calculation yields

$$S_{MC} = \frac{\lambda k}{2} + N\sigma \tag{14}$$

where $\lambda$ and $\sigma$ are explicit functions of $k$ and $N$ as will be elaborated shortly. One may go further and perform the second order calculation for $g[\{s_j\}]$ in eq.(4) which will add a correction term $-\frac{3}{2}\log N$ to this above expression given by eq.(14) [9] . But, here we shall ignore this relatively small correction term and carry on with the leading order terms of the microcanonical entropy.

As far as the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda$ and $\sigma$ are concerned, they are solvable in terms of the macroscopic parameters, here $k$ and $N$, which define the microcanonical ensemble [28]. It is very simple to understand this fact since we have two equations and two unknown Lagrange multipliers. The two equations are obtained by using eq.(13) in eq.(9a) and eq.(9b) and can be written as

$$\exp[\sigma] = \sum_j (2j+1) \exp[-\lambda C_j] \tag{15a}$$

$$k/2 = N \sum_j C_j (2j+1) \exp[-\lambda C_j - \sigma] \tag{15b}$$

Using eq.(15a) and eq.(15b) one can show that $k = -2N(d\sigma/d\lambda)$. Now, we can calculate $\sigma$ as an explicit function of $\lambda$ in the limit $k \to \infty$ from eq.(15a) which can be approximated as

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \exp[\sigma] \;\simeq\; \int_0^\infty (2j+1)\exp\left[-\lambda\sqrt{j(j+1)}\right] dj - 1 \tag{16}$$

where we have used $C_j = \sqrt{j(j+1)}$. The above integration yields $\sigma = \log\left(\frac{2}{\lambda^2} - 1\right)$ and hence $d\sigma/d\lambda = 4/[\lambda(\lambda^2-2)]$ . Putting back $d\sigma/d\lambda$ in the equation $k/2N = -d\sigma/d\lambda$ we obtain a cubic equation in $\lambda$ for given values of $k$ and $N$ which is given by

$$\lambda^3 - 2\lambda + \frac{8}{k/N} = 0 \tag{17}$$

from which $\lambda$ can be obtained in terms of $k$ and $N$. A graphical plot of the solution of $\lambda$ in terms of $k/N$ along with some information theoretic arguments reveal that[8]

$$1 < \lambda < \sqrt{2} \tag{18}$$

Also one can avoid this solution, graph plot etc. and simply argue that $\sigma$ should be real and negative, which will also lead to the same range of $\lambda$ [9].

As far as the thermodynamical aspect is concerned it is necessary to write the microcanonical entropy in terms of the average area and the number of punctures, first shown in [30]. Using the relation $k = A_{cl}/4\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 \simeq A^\star/4\pi\gamma\ell_p^2$ the eq.(14) can be cast in the following form

$$S_{MC} = \frac{\lambda A^\star}{8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2} + N\sigma \tag{19}$$

It is to be noted that, *only* to retrieve the familiar BHAL, one has to choose $\gamma = \lambda/2\pi$. In this process, $\gamma$ does not remain ambiguous any more and is completely fixed by the given values of $k$ and $N$. Hence, for the BHAL to be valid, there is a simple unavoidable consequence, that is, the $\gamma$ ambiguity which is present throughout the whole LQG formulation gets fixed by the parameters defined only at the boundary, namely $k$ and $N$, which are involved in an equilibrium equation of state[8, 9]. The allowed range of values for $\gamma$ is given by

$$0.159 < \gamma < 0.225 \tag{20}$$

## 4 A Model Energy Spectrum for the QIH

In the LQG framework, although there is a well defined area spectrum for a QIH, the energy spectrum remains to be found. Truly speaking, the thermodynamic stability analysis of a QIH can not be completed satisfactorily without having a true energy spectrum of the QIH. Hence, in this section we shall propose a possible structure of a quantum energy spectrum for a QIH which will enable us to proceed further with the thermodynamic analysis of the QIH.

To begin with, first it should be noted that the punctures of the QIH do not interact with each other and are considered to be independent . As a consequence, the quantum area spectrum of the QIH in the LQG framework, is just the summation of the single puncture area contribution as known from LQG. As we are modeling the energy spectrum of the QIH from a pure quantum viewpoint, the available fundamental elements at our disposal are the non interacting punctures on the QIH and the area contribution $8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2 C_j$ of a puncture with spin $j$. Hence, having no *a priori* knowledge of the energy spectrum of a QIH in the LQG framework, we propose a very general form of single puncture energy spectrum written as

$$E_j = \ell_p \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} b_n {A_j}^n = \ell_p \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) {C_j}^n \tag{21}$$

where $\mathrm{Dim}[b_n] = \ell_p^{-2n}$ and $a_n(\gamma) = b_n(8\pi\gamma\ell_p^2)^n$. For simplicity, we consider $n$ to take only integral values and $n \geq 0$ to ensure incremental monotonicity of the energy spectrum with the area contribution of a single puncture. In fact, we model the contribution to the energy spectrum from a single puncture of the QIH by a power series truncated by the positive definite parameter $\Lambda$.

**Remarks :** Since this kind of model energy spectrum of the QIH has not been studied previously in literature and any property of such spectrum is hitherto unknown, to avoid any problem with the convergence of such spectrum we have used the cut-off parameter($\Lambda$) *a priori*. We shall see that, at least from the thermodynamic viewpoint, we can predict that such a cut-off is indeed required and should emerge automatically from a true quantization of the horizon energy, if can be done anyhow.

Now, it follows from eq.(21) that the energy eigenvalue of the QIH in a state designated by the spin configuration $\{s_j\}$ will be given by

$$\hat{E}|\{s_j\}\rangle = \ell_p \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) s_j {C_j}^n |\{s_j\}\rangle \tag{22}$$

where $\hat{E}$ is the energy operator for the QIH.

Hence, the expectation value of the energy operator for the QIH is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle\hat{E}\rangle &= \langle\Psi|\hat{E}|\Psi\rangle \\
&= \ell_p \sum_{\{s_j\}} \omega[\{s_j\}] \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) s_j {C_j}^n \\
&= \ell_p \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) s_j^{\star} {C_j}^n + \text{ sub-dominant contributions} \\
&= E^{\star} \pm \mathscr{O}(\ell_p)
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Now, we can calculate $E^\star$ explicitly by using $s_j^\star$ given by eq.(13), $\sigma = \log(2/\lambda^2 - 1)$ and the derivatives of $\sigma$. A bit of algebraic manipulation leads to the result

$$\begin{aligned}
E^\star &= \ell_p \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\gamma) s_j^\star {C_j}^n \\
&= \ell_p N \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\gamma)(2j+1){C_j}^n \exp(-\lambda C_j - \sigma) \\
&\simeq \ell_p N \int \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\gamma)(2j+1){C_j}^n \exp(-\lambda C_j - \sigma) \\
&= \ell_p N \exp(-\sigma) \left[ a_0(\gamma)\exp(\sigma) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n(\gamma) \sum_j (2j+1){C_j}^n \exp(-\lambda C_j) \right] \\
&= \ell_p N \frac{\lambda^2}{(2-\lambda^2)} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(\gamma) \left[ \frac{2\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{2+n}} - \delta_n^0 \right] \\
&= \frac{\lambda^2 F(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma)}{(2-\lambda^2)} \ell_p N \qquad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

where $F(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma) = \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) \left[\frac{2\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{2+n}} - \delta_n^0\right]$, which is obviously a positive definite function of $\lambda$. Also one should note that $\lambda^2 < 2$ is the most crucial and indispensable inequality of this theory which imposes an upper bound on the parameter $\lambda$. It follows from the validity of the eq.(24) and is also the reality condition for $\sigma$.

Now, one can show by a straightforward calculation similar to the one for deriving eq.(24) that

$$A^\star = \frac{32\pi\gamma}{\lambda(2-\lambda^2)} \ell_p^2 N \qquad (25)$$

Hence, from eq.(24) and eq.(25) we have a relation between the mean values of energy and area of the QIH given by

$$E^\star = \frac{\xi(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma)}{\ell_p} A^\star \qquad (26)$$

where the quantity $\xi(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma) = \frac{\lambda^3 F(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma)}{32\pi\gamma}$ can be explicitly written as

$$\xi(\Lambda,\lambda,\gamma) = \frac{\lambda^3}{32\pi\gamma} \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma) \left[ \frac{2\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{2+n}} - \delta_n^0 \right] \qquad (27)$$

Now, let us recollect that the $\gamma$-fit is required only to manifest the BHAL. Otherwise $S_{MC}$ will be given by eq.(19), the Lagrange multipliers being functions of $k$ and $N$. So, we shall always make the $\gamma$-fit after performing all the calculations. The microcanonical entropy *without the $\gamma$-fit*, given by eq.(19) can be expressed in terms of the equilibrium energy of the QIH using eq.(26) as

$$S_{MC} = \frac{\lambda}{8\pi\gamma\xi\ell_p} E^\star + N\sigma \qquad (28)$$

Therefore, inverse temperature is defined in the microcanonical ensemble as

$$\beta = \left.\frac{\partial S_{MC}}{\partial E^{\star}}\right|_{N} = \frac{\lambda}{8\pi\gamma\xi\ell_p} \tag{29}$$

which enables us to write the microcanonical entropy in the familiar thermodynamic form as

$$S_{MC} = \beta E^{\star} + N\sigma \tag{30}$$

Hence, from eq.(29) and using eq.(27), the expression for the temperature can be written as

$$T \;=\; \frac{8\pi\gamma\xi\ell_p}{\lambda} = \frac{\ell_p}{4}\,\lambda^2 \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma)\left[\frac{2\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{2+n}} - \delta_n^0\right] \tag{31}$$

Hence, we have derived the expression for the temperature from the microcanonical ensemble thermodynamics. When we consider the system in thermal equilibrium with a heat bath at some particular temperature in the *canonical* ensemble, it is ensured that the common temperature is defined as above and is treated as a free parameter rather than being a derived quantity.

## 5 A Model Hamiltonian for the QIH

In this section we shall focus on the Hamiltonian of the QIH which will result in the proposed energy spectrum discussed previously. Having proposed the energy spectrum of the QIH, it is quite easy to write down the corresponding Hamiltonian operator for the QIH. But, one will surely wonder that why should an operator be the Hamiltonian. The only way to justify this fact is to show that the operator satisfies certain requisite properties of a Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonian corresponding to the model energy spectrum, by construction, inherits such properties. To explore these facts, let us proceed towards the explicit structure of the Hamiltonian.

While looking at the description of a QIH in the LQG framework, the elementary quantum building blocks of the QIH at once shows us the scenario where we must think of any operator belonging to the QIH Hilbert space as being contributed from the individual punctures. Motivated by these facts, the energy spectrum of the QIH was proposed. Likewise, it follows that the Hamiltonian operator for the QIH should be written as

$$\hat{H}_S \equiv \hat{H}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{H}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \cdots + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{H}_{j_N} \tag{32}$$

similar to the area operator of the QIH given by

$$\hat{A} \equiv \hat{A}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{A}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \cdots + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{A}_{j_N} \tag{33}$$

The area operator is a gauge invariant observable follows from the fact that when the bulk spin network pierces the surface $S$, the puncture is assigned with an SU(2) spin and the area contribution from that puncture is nothing but the Casimir of the SU(2) gauge group of the underlying theory. Hence, we can argue that the 'powers' of the Casimir being also gauge invariant can as well be the contribution from a single puncture to some other gauge invariant observable smeared over the QIH, say the Hamiltonian. So, one can propose that

$$\hat{H}_j \equiv \ell_p \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} b_n \hat{A}_j^n \tag{34}$$

where $\Lambda$ is a cut-off already introduced earlier. Hence, the Hamiltonian can now be written as

$$\hat{H}_S \equiv \ell_p \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} b_n \left( \hat{A}_{j_1}^n \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{A}_{j_2}^n \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{I}_{j_N} + \cdots + \hat{I}_{j_1} \otimes \hat{I}_{j_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \hat{A}_{j_N}^n \right) \tag{35}$$

Besides the gauge invariance of the above operator, there is yet another property which follows from its construction. It is straightforward to see that it commutes with the area operator

$$\left[ \hat{H}_S, \hat{A} \right] \equiv \hat{0} \tag{36}$$

The crucial implication that it has, due to this commutativity, is that, if there is some evolution parameter $\tau$ with respect to which the QIH evolves, then it is evident that

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \langle \Psi | \hat{A} | \Psi \rangle = \frac{1}{i\hbar} \langle \Psi | \left[ \hat{H}_S, \hat{A} \right] | \Psi \rangle = 0 \tag{37}$$

i.e. the expectation value of the area operator of a QIH is a constant of motion. This is perfectly consistent with the fact that in the correspondence limit, the most crucial classical property of the corresponding classical Isolated Horizon i.e. fixed classical area, emerges as a consequence of the construction of the model Hamiltonian. Further, as a result of this commutativity in eq.(36), we can also say that the states of the quantum Chern-Simons theory describing the local quantum degrees of freedom of the QIH, are simultaneous eigenstates of the area operator and the model Hamiltonian for the QIH.

Of course there remains several other questions to be answered about this model Hamiltonian as far as its candidature of being the true Hamiltonian of the QIH which will result from a true quantization of the theory is concerned, resolving which is itself a mammoth task to complete with various technical subtleties to overcome. As far as this work is concerned, our aim is to analyze the thermodynamic properties of the QIH having a very general kind of energy spectrum that one can construct from a pure quantum viewpoint devoid of any classical notions. To have a taste of the motivations on which this proposed Hamiltonian is based upon, one can see [31]. This section was especially intended to provide moderate enough justification for the structure of the proposed model energy spectrum for the QIH, which we think, has been done up to a satisfactory extent.

# 6 Canonical Ensemble

Now, to get more insight about the thermodynamical properties of QIH we shall switch over to the canonical ensemble and follow the arguments made in [15, 16]. To begin with, we must write down the all important canonical partition function which is defined as

$$Z_C = Tr(\exp -\beta \hat{H}) \tag{38}$$

where we have considered an ensemble of spacetimes, admitting QIH as an inner boundary, in contact with a heat bath with inverse temperature $\beta$. $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian for the system. Now, unlike the classical theory, the degrees of freedom of the quantum theory are independent as far as the bulk and the boundary are concerned [6, 7]. The Hilbert space for the quantum spacetime, with QIH as the inner boundary($S$) of the bulk quantum geometry($B$), can be written as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_S \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. As a result we can write the Hamiltonian for the thermodynamic system as

$$\hat{H} \equiv \hat{H}_S \otimes \hat{I}_B + \hat{I}_S \otimes \hat{H}_B \tag{39}$$

where $\hat{I}$ are the identity operators for the corresponding Hilbert spaces designated by the suffixes. Similarly, the wave function for a quantum spacetime, admitting QIH as an internal boundary, can be written as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{S,B} C_{SB} |\Psi_S\rangle \otimes |\Psi_B\rangle \tag{40}$$

It should be noted that the Hilbert space, the quantum states, etc. are all results of the kinematic quantization of classical degrees of freedom in a suitable choice of time slicing. Now, from the knowledge of the Hamiltonian formulation of General Relativity(GR) we know that, GR being a covariant theory, the bulk Hamiltonian is zero. Hence, we can write the quantum version of this constraint as

$$\hat{H}_B |\Psi_B\rangle \approx 0 \tag{41}$$

Rewriting the partition function in eq.(38) in terms of the bulk and the boundary sectors using eq.(39), eq.(40) and applying the quantum Hamiltonian constraint given by eq.(41) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Z_C &= \sum_{S,B} |C_{SB}|^2 \langle\Psi_B| \otimes \langle\Psi_S| \exp -\beta(\hat{H}_S \otimes \hat{I}_B + \hat{I}_S \otimes \hat{H}_B)|\Psi_S\rangle \otimes |\Psi_B\rangle \\ &= \sum_{S} |\bar{C}_S|^2 \langle\Psi_S| \exp -\beta \hat{H}_S |\Psi_S\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $|\bar{C}_S|^2 = \sum_B |C_{SB}|^2 \langle\Psi_B|\Psi_B\rangle$. Now, one should *not* consider this QIH Hamiltonian($\hat{H}_S$) to be that of the quantum Chern-Simons theory. Being a *topological* field theory, the Hamiltonian of the Chern-Simons theory vanishes. This would have resulted in the partition function to be zero ! Fortunately, there is another Hamiltonian defined on the Isolated Horizon which provides a well defined notion of energy and satisfies the first law under the Hamiltonian evolution of space in time[3]. Here, we assume a quantum version of that Hamiltonian as $\hat{H}_S$. The eigenvalues of this Hamiltonian will give us the quantum energy spectrum of the QIH and the eigenvalue equation can be written as

$$\hat{H}_S|\Psi_S\rangle = E_S|\Psi_S\rangle \tag{42}$$

Hence, the partition function can be simply written as

$$Z_C = \sum_S |\bar{C}_S|^2 \exp -\beta E_S \tag{43}$$

In eq.(43), $|\bar{C}_S|^2$ denotes the probability of finding the QIH at a particular surface state irrespective of the states of the bulk quantum geometry. Now, we do not have a quantum version of the Hamiltonian of the horizon introduced in [3]. But in the previous section we have argued that similar to the area spectrum of the QIH in the LQG framework, we can construct an energy spectrum of the QIH by virtue of the additive contributions of the noninteracting punctures. Thus, using the energy spectrum given by eq.(22) and rewriting the partition function as sum over spin configuration we get

$$Z_C = \sum_{\{s_j\}} \Omega[\{s_j\}] \ \exp -\beta E_{\{s_j\}}$$

The state having energy $E_{\{s_j\}}$ exhibits $\Omega[\{s_j\}]$-fold degeneracy which in the continuum limit can be viewed to be the density of states. Since $\omega[\{s_j^\star\}] \simeq 1$ which alternatively implies that $\Omega[\{s_j^\star\}]$ is very very large compared to the number of microstates for other configurations, we can write the exact partition function as the sum of the dominant part and the negligible fluctuations as follows

$$\begin{aligned} Z_C &= \Omega[\{s_j^\star\}] \exp -\beta E_{\{s_j^\star\}} + \ \text{sub-dominant terms} \\ &= \Omega[\{s_j^\star\}] \exp -\beta E^\star + \ \bar{\delta} \\ &= Z_C^\star + \ \bar{\delta} \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $E_{\{s_j^\star\}} = \sum_j s_j^\star E_j = E^\star$ and $\bar{\delta}$ denotes the contributions from the sub-dominant configurations contributing to the thermal fluctuations. Having calculated the partition function it is straightforward to show that the ensemble average of the energy of the QIH comes out to be

$$\bar{E} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \log Z_C \simeq E^\star \tag{45}$$

Now, taking logarithm of both sides of eq.(44) and using the definition of canonical entropy $S_C = \log Z_C + \beta\bar{E}$ and using $\bar{E} \simeq E^\star$ from eq.(23) it is straightforward to show that

$$S_C = S_{MC} + \log(1 + \bar{\delta}/Z_C^\star) \tag{46}$$

where $S_{MC}$ is given by eq.(30). This is a familiar result previously shown in literature in the context of black hole thermodynamics in [15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27], but in a different mathematical approach where the fluctuations appear as terms of Taylor expansion about the equilibrium (see [28]). It can be also shown by this method

[21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27] that the argument of the logarithm is equivalent to the specific heat of the thermodynamic system under consideration as a consequence of which the canonical entropy becomes ill defined for systems having negative definite specific heat. Here, having constructed the energy spectrum of the QIH we shall directly calculate the specific heat of the QIH and examine its stability for the allowed values of $\gamma$.

By definition, the specific heat is given by

$$C = \left.\frac{\partial E^\star}{\partial T}\right|_N = \left.\frac{d\lambda}{dT}\frac{\partial E^\star}{\partial \lambda}\right|_N$$

One can easily check that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{dT}{d\lambda} &= -\frac{\lambda \ell_p}{2}\sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma)\left[\frac{n\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{n+2}} + \delta_n^0\right] \\ \frac{\partial E^\star}{\partial \lambda} &= \frac{\lambda}{(2-\lambda^2)^2}\sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma)\left[\frac{2\Gamma(n+3)}{\lambda^{n+2}}\left(\lambda^2 - \frac{2n}{n+2}\right) + 4\delta_n^0\right]\ell_p N\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows that the specific heat for the QIH is given by

$$C = -\frac{2N}{(2-\lambda^2)^2}\frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma)\left[\frac{2\Gamma(n+3)}{\lambda^{n+2}}\left(\lambda^2 - \frac{2n}{n+2}\right) + 4\delta_n^0\right]}{\sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} a_n(\gamma)\left[\frac{n\Gamma(n+2)}{\lambda^{n+2}} + \delta_n^0\right]} \tag{47}$$

From the above expression for the specific heat we can not get any idea about the stability of the QIH since the $a_n$-s are completely unknown to us as we have only assumed such a general energy spectrum for a consistent thermodynamic analysis of the stable QIHs. But, since we are involved in a calculation of a purely quantum origin, we can use some known classical or semiclassical results as inputs so as to get an idea of the unknown quantities in this quantum theory.

## 6.1 Single Puncture Energy Spectrum as a power law

As far as this work is concerned we have only tried to construct a model energy spectrum for the QIH which is *not* the result of a true quantization of the horizon energy. So, we shall try to look at some of the consequences of this model energy spectrum by making some specific choices. Let us investigate the special case where the single puncture energy spectrum follows a power law of the single puncture area contribution i.e. we choose $b_n = \kappa_n \delta_n^m \ell_p^{-2n}$ with $m \geq 1$. The single puncture energy spectrum given by eq.(21) written as a polynomial gets reduced to a power law given by

$$E_j = \ell_p b_m {A_j}^m = \ell_p \kappa_m (8\pi\gamma)^m {C_j}^m \tag{48}$$

where $\kappa_m$ is an unknown positive constant. As a result of this choice, one can also show from eq.(47) that the expression for specific heat is now reduced to

$$C = \frac{4N}{(2-\lambda^2)^2}\left(1 + \frac{2}{m}\right)\left(\frac{2m}{m+2} - \lambda^2\right) \tag{49}$$

It is interesting to see that

$$\lim_{m\to\infty} C = \frac{4N}{(2-\lambda^2)} \tag{50}$$

This implies that any finite value of $m$, which is obvious for a physical theory ($m \to \infty$ is unphysical), the value of $\lambda^2$ will be certainly bounded from above by the constant $\lambda_m^2 < 2$ for the QIH to have local thermodynamic stability i.e. $C > 0$, where $\lambda_m^2 = \frac{2m}{m+2}$. Hence, there is a range $\lambda_m^2 < \lambda^2 < 2$ for which the theory does not admit a thermodynamically stable QIH. The range of the allowed values of $\lambda$ for a given power law $E_j \propto {A_j}^m$ of the single puncture energy spectrum is given by

$$C < 0, \quad \lambda_m < \lambda < \sqrt{2} \tag{51a}$$

$$C > 0, \quad 1 \ < \lambda \ < \lambda_m \tag{51b}$$

where $\lambda_m = \sqrt{\frac{2m}{m+2}}$ and the lower bound of $\lambda$ for $C > 0$ follows from the inequality (18) . As a consequence of the power law, the expression of the temperature given by eq.(31) is now reduced to

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_m \ell_p \Gamma(m+2)\left[\frac{8\pi\gamma}{\lambda}\right]^m \tag{52}$$

For the BHAL to be valid, we must fit $\gamma = \frac{\lambda}{2\pi}$ which reduces eq.(52) to

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_m 4^m \Gamma(m+2)\ell_p \tag{53}$$

Hence, the temperature clearly carries the exponent of the power law which governs the single puncture energy spectrum.

*Choosing the coefficients :* Now, we can also investigate another case considering a particular choice of $\kappa_m$. Just for the moment if we go back to the general single puncture energy spectrum given by eq.(21), one can argue that the coefficients must decrease with increasing $m$ so as to make the energy spectrum convergent. Hence, from the expression for the temperature in this power law analysis we have a good reason to choose $\kappa_m = \kappa 4^{-m}\Gamma(m+2)^{-1}$, $\kappa$ being some finite positive constant. As a result the temperature in eq.(52) is now given by

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\kappa\ell_p\left[\frac{2\pi\gamma}{\lambda}\right]^m \tag{54}$$

which, for the BHAL to be valid i.e. for $\gamma = \lambda/2\pi$, reduces to

$$T = \frac{1}{2}\kappa\ell_p \tag{55}$$

This is some sort of a ‘universal’ temperature for black hole horizons at equilibrium, very much alike the one reported in [30] on semi classical grounds.

The general conclusion one can draw from the above analysis is that, for a QIH, if the BHAL is considered to be valid, the allowed range of $\gamma$ is given by

$$C < 0, \quad \frac{\lambda_m}{2\pi} < \gamma < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi} \tag{56a}$$

$$C > 0, \quad 0.159 \ < \gamma \ < \frac{\lambda_m}{2\pi} \tag{56b}$$

where the lower bound on $\gamma$ for $C > 0$ is obtained from the inequality (20).

Hence, from the above findings, we can make the following statement :

*A theory of thermodynamically stable QIH having the single puncture energy spectrum given by $E_j \propto A_j{}^m$, whose entropy follows the BHAL, can only allow values of the Barbero-Immirzi parameter bounded by the range given by* $0.159 < \gamma < \frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2m}{m+2}}$ .

As far as the full range of allowed values of $\gamma$, given by eq.(20), is concerned, the above statement has an immediate consequence :

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\sqrt{\frac{2m}{m+2}} > 0.159 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad m > 1 \quad \text{for} \quad C > 0 \tag{57}$$

i.e. a QIH exhibiting the single puncture energy spectrum as $E_j \propto A_j{}^m$ can be thermodynamically stable if and only if $m > 1$. In other words, if one models the horizon energy spectrum considering the single puncture energy exhibiting the power law $E_j \propto A_j{}^m$ with $m = 1$, there will not be any possible value of $\gamma$ to have a consistent quantum theory of spacetime admitting a thermodynamically stable QIH in the LQG framework.

**Remarks :** What is alarming in the above analysis is that the thermodynamics of a QIH is strongly governed by the single puncture energy spectrum if it follows a power law. This is a very unconventional result contradicting our usual notion about thermodynamic quantities being independent of single 'particle' energy spectrum of ordinary quantum systems. This is a very crucial point to be noted where thermodynamics of quantum black holes becomes very special. The reason for this strange behavior is simply because a quantum black hole is a very special object manifesting high energy quantum gravity effects which, as a physical system, is far from being analogous to other thermodynamic systems that we generally study (e.g. ideal gas, etc.) in low energy scale. It is only the mathematical structure of the statistical mechanical formulation which is (fortunately) very much alike what we do for ordinary systems. But, at some stage, there ought to be a big difference between the thermodynamics of quantum black holes and other usual systems studied in textbooks. The above analysis shows this difference. It signifies the relevance of strong quantum gravity effects as far as black hole physics is concerned.

## 6.2 A Specific Case : $E_j \propto A_j$

In this section, we study a special case of our general single puncture energy spectrum in eq.(21) as a particular example, which is of immense importance as far as contemporary literature is concerned [30, 32, 33]. From eq.(26), it is evident that, if the single puncture energy contribution can be written as a polynomial in the single puncture area contribution, then the average energy of the QIH is proportional to its average area. Generally we take these average values to be very close to the classical values and thus obtain the classical laws as mean effects of the underlying quantum theory. Now, if one derives the classical result from a classical theory it is not possible to predict the quantum fine structure of the spectrum of the relevant observables . To be more specific, if one shows that $E_{cl} \propto A_{cl} \implies E^\star \propto A^\star$, it does *not* mean that $E_j \propto A_j$, but may be something more general than that and this is what has been evident from our model single puncture energy spectrum given by eq.(21). Hence it is clear that the consideration of $E_j \propto A_j$ in [30, 32, 33] following from the classical proportionality is only a very specific choice. But, since some important results are obtained and crucial predictions have been made from this particular choice $E_j \propto A_j$, it is worth studying the results for this specific case following from the detailed thermodynamic analysis presented in this work involving a general QIH energy spectrum.

The specific heat given by eq.(49), being dependent on the exponent of the single puncture energy spectrum power law, must have different consequences depending on the value of the exponent. Hence, we consider the specific power law for the *single puncture energy spectrum* $E_j = \kappa_1 A_j$, which is nothing but choosing $m = 1$ in the analysis of the general power law spectrum. This particular choice of the energy spectrum yields the specific heat to be

$$C = \frac{3N}{(2-\lambda^2)^2}\left(\frac{2}{3} - \lambda^2\right)$$

Now, this above result has an inevitable conclusion. For the QIH, having this particular single puncture energy spectrum we must have $\lambda < \sqrt{2/3}$ for the QIH to have local thermodynamic stability i.e. $C > 0$. As a consequence, for the BHAL to be valid for the QIH, we must have $\gamma < \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}\pi}$ to have a theory of stable QIH. One can check that upper bound on $\lambda$ and also $\gamma$ are less than their corresponding lowest possible allowed values given by eq.(18) and eq.(20). Hence, the single puncture energy spectrum $E_j \propto A_j$ does not allow a quantum theory of spacetime admitting QIH with local thermodynamic stability in the LQG framework.The thermodynamic instability of a QIH with this particular energy spectrum has been confirmed earlier in a somewhat less rigorous manner in [34].

## 6.3 Revisiting the Complete Energy Spectrum

Having done all these analyses in the previous sections, now we at least have got a hint about the coefficients $a_n$ so as to get an explicit structure of the full energy spectrum of the QIH. Since we only proposed the single puncture energy contribution given by eq.(21) which resulted in the QIH energy spectrum in eq.(22), we did not have any idea about the coefficients $a_n$. But, considering the choice of the coefficients $a_n$ from the power law analysis shown above, we can propose the single puncture energy spectrum to be

$$E_j = \kappa\ell_p \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} \frac{{A_j}^n}{4^n \Gamma(n+2)} \tag{58}$$

from which it follows that the energy spectrum for a QIH will be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}|\{s_j\}\rangle &= \kappa\ell_p \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} \frac{1}{4^n \Gamma(n+2)} s_j {A_j}^n |\{s_j\}\rangle \\ &= \kappa\ell_p \sum_j \sum_{n=0}^{\Lambda} \frac{(2\pi\gamma)^n}{\Gamma(n+2)} s_j {C_j}^n |\{s_j\}\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where we have used $A_j = 8\pi\gamma C_j$. The form of the coefficients can be explicitly written as

$$a_n(\gamma) = \kappa\ell_p \, \frac{(2\pi\gamma)^n}{\Gamma(n+2)} \tag{60}$$

where $\kappa$ is some unknown positive constant. Considering the energy spectrum of the QIH given by eq.(59) and considering the validity of the BHAL $(\gamma = \lambda/2\pi)$ , the specific heat comes out to be

$$C = \frac{2N(\Lambda^2 + 5\Lambda + 8)}{(1 - 2\pi^2\gamma^2)(\Lambda^2 + \Lambda + 8\pi^2\gamma^2)} \left[\frac{\Lambda^2 + \Lambda}{\Lambda^2 + 5\Lambda + 8} - 2\pi^2\gamma^2\right] \tag{61}$$

and the expression of the equilibrium temperature is given by

$$T = \frac{1}{8}\kappa\Lambda\ell_p \left[1 + \frac{(1 - 2\pi^2\gamma^2)}{\Lambda}\right] \tag{62}$$

Hence, we can conclude that the QIH having the energy spectrum given by eq.(59) is thermodynamically stable if and only if

$$\gamma < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi} \left[\frac{\Lambda^2 + \Lambda}{\Lambda^2 + 5\Lambda + 8}\right]^{1/2} \tag{63}$$

Again, one can see that the bound on $\gamma$ is regulated by a parameter controlling the single puncture energy spectrum.

The point to be noted in this above calculation is that, although the limit $\Lambda \to \infty$ leads to the result $\gamma < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi}$, which is absolutely consistent with the full range of $\gamma$, the cause of concern is the expression for the temperature, given by eq.(62), which diverges in this limit. Hence, at this moment we can not model the single puncture energy spectrum with some convergent series with infinite terms and the cut off $(\Lambda)$ seems to be absolutely necessary. Further investigation is required regarding the full energy spectrum to have deeper insight.

# 7 Discussion

In this concluding section we shall like to remark on some crucial facts about this simple minded thermodynamic analyses of QIHs in the LQG framework for which the entropy follows the BHAL up to leading order in area. The points to be commented on are : 1) the upper bound on $\gamma$ in the microcanonical ensemble, 2) the equilibrium temperature of the QIH and 3) justification of the model energy spectrum and the Hamiltonian operator of the QIH.

As far as the *upper bound* on $\gamma$ is concerned, this is an artifact of the *exclusion of zero spin punctures* from consideration while the entropy is calculated. It can be checked by looking at eq.(16) which is obtained from eq.(15a) by manipulating the lower limit of the sum over spins and then replacing the summation by integration for $k \to \infty$. This leads to the result $\sigma = \log(2/\lambda^2 - 1)$ as a consequence of which we must have $\lambda^2 < 2$ for $\sigma$ to be real. Hence, for the BHAL to be valid($\gamma = \lambda/2\pi$), we have an *universal* upper bound on the Barbero-Immirzi parameter. Physically, the zero spin punctures do not contribute to the quantum area of the QIH and can be added arbitrarily to a QIH without altering its quantum area. This is physically unacceptable as it can lead to infinite entropy of the QIH. In fact a closer investigation reveals that for a fixed $k$, $N$ can not be increased arbitrarily which will take the value of $\gamma$ below its lower bound. To mention, even though the upper bound on $\gamma$ was obtained already in [8], the explanation of its physical significance was lacking. Added to this, one should note that the upper bounds on the BI parameter($\gamma$) regulated by parameters of the QIH energy spectrum, whether the power law or the full energy spectrum, are completely within the full range of $\gamma$ obtained from the study of the microcanonical ensemble proving the self-consistency of the extensive thermodynamic analysis presented in this work.

Let us now discuss a bit about the local equilibrium temperature of the QIH. The classical Isolated Horizon(IH) framework [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] is a completely local description and a generalization of event horizons to more practical situations (e.g. non-stationarity) where radiation is allowed arbitrarily close to the IH. Hence, the properties of IH are completely local. Thus, it is needless to say that the IH temperature is a local entity which is independent of the dynamics away from the horizon and must not depend on any global parameters of the associated spacetime. Also from the quantum viewpoint, the local degrees of freedom on the QIH does not know about the events away from the horizon [6, 7]. The local temperature, if somehow can be detected, must be either a universal constant characterizing a black hole [30] or at most depend on some local parameter which is intrinsic to the QIH geometry, such as $\Lambda$ in eq.(62). Now, whether this $\Lambda$ is something universal or not is a matter of future investigation and to be honest, we can not comment on its nature right now. On the other hand, the Hawking temperature is the red-shifted local temperature measured only at asymptotic infinity which obviously depends on the geometry of the spacetime away from the horizon and hence on the global parameters, like mass, charge or angular momentum, of the associated black hole spacetime and is not expected to depend on any local property of the QIH. Thus, in this work, the fact that the local temperature of the QIH is potentially influenced by the parameters governing the energy spectrum of the QIH, is not at all surprising and can be expected, although it goes against our usual notion of thermodynamics of a system of quantum constituents being independent of the single ‘particle’ energy spectrum. To find a smooth link between the local temperature of a QIH and the corresponding Hawking temperature at asymptotic infinity is a major challenge yet to be overcome completely from the quantum viewpoint, although there exists an semi-classical attempt to tackle this issue in literature [30, 41].

Finally we shall make some remarks on the model energy spectrum of the QIH proposed here. The proposal of this kind of energy spectrum of a QIH has not been made earlier in literature. Generally, one considers the horizon energy as a function of the horizon area (e.g. power law). This intuition works in our mind due to our instinctive affinity to look at a quantum theory through the classical spectacles. To be more explicit, in numerous cases of the study of black holes the mass formula for known black hole solutions are expressed in terms of the area and addressed as the mass spectrum of the black hole [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. In fact, many a times, in such formulae, the area spectrum of LQG is used directly in the classical formula and the mass of the black hole is considered to be quantized [22, 24, 35] which is of course not a true quantization of the horizon energy. A genuine energy spectrum for a QIH should be derived fundamentally from the quantum theory, such as the area, volume and length operators in quantum gravity [36, 37, 38, 39, 40]. Motivated by these facts, we have modeled an energy spectrum of the QIH using the building blocks of the area spectrum of the QIH. Interestingly, the result provided by our model energy spectrum in eq.(26) from a purely quantum statistical and thermodynamical perspective, is apparently similar to the (semi)classical results of [32, 33, 41, 42] where the local energy of the horizon is proportional to its area. It remains to be seen whether it is possible to construct the corresponding Hamitonian operator for the QIH yielding the kind of energy spectrum discussed here. Of course, finding such a Hamiltonian operator from the quantum theory will be a big step ahead in the context of quantum black hole physics and can be seen as a future project of potential consequence.

# References

[1] A. Ashtekar, A. Corichi and K. Krasnov, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **3** (2000) 419-478; arXiv:gr-qc/9905089v3 3, 4, 20

[2] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle and S. Fairhurst, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **17** (2000) 253-298; arXiv:gr-qc/9907068v2 3, 4, 20

[3] A. Ashtekar, S. Fairhurst and B. Krishnan, *Phys. Rev.* **D62** (2000) 104025; arXiv:gr-qc/0005083v3 3, 4, 14, 20

[4] A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, *Living Rev. Rel.* **7**(2004) 10;arXiv:gr-qc/0407042v3 3, 4, 20

[5] A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle, O. Dreyer, S. Fairhurst, B. Krishnan, J. Lewandowski and J. Wisniewski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85** (2000) 3564-3567, arXiv:gr-qc/0006006v2 3, 4, 20

[6] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez, A. Corichi and K. Krasnov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 904-907; arXiv:gr-qc/9710007v1 3, 4, 13, 20

[7] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez and K. Krasnov, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **4** (2000) 1; arXiv:gr-qc/0005126v1 3, 4, 5, 6, 13, 20

[8] A. Majhi, *Microcanonical Entropy of Isolated Horizon and the Barbero-Immirzi parameter*; arXiv:1205.3487v2 3, 4, 8, 20

[9] A. Majhi and P. Majumdar, *'Quantum Hairs' and Isolated Horizon Entropy from Chern-Simons theory*, arXiv:1301.4553 3, 5, 7, 8

[10] J. F. Barbero G, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 5507-5510; arXiv:gr-qc/9410014v1 3

[11] J. F. Barbero G, *Phys. Rev.* **D51** (1995) 5498-5506; arXiv:gr-qc/9410013v1 3

[12] G. Immirzi, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) L177-L181; arXiv:gr-qc/9612030v1 3

[13] G. Immirzi, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **57** (1997) 65-72; arXiv:gr-qc/9701052v1 3

[14] J. D. Bekenstein, *Phys. Rev.* **D7** (1973) 23332346; S. W. Hawking, *Phys. Rev.* **D13** (1976) 191197 3

[15] P. Majumdar, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 1747, arXiv: gr-qc/0701014 3, 13, 14

[16] A. Majhi and P. Majumdar, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29** (2012) 135013, arXiv:1108.4670v1 3, 13

[17] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21** (2004) R53, arXiv:gr-qc/0404018v2 4

[18] E. Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys* **121** (1989) 351-399 5

[19] R. K. Kaul and P. Majumdar, *Phys.Lett.* **B439** (1998) 267-270; arXiv:gr-qc/9801080v2 5

[20] R.Kaul, *SIGMA* **8, 005** (2012),arXiv:1201.6102v2

[21] A. Chatterjee and P. Majumdar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92** (2004) 141031; arXiv: gr-qc/0309026 14, 15, 21

[22] A. Chatterjee and P. Majumdar, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 024003; arXiv: gr-qc/0409097 14, 15, 21

[23] A. Chatterjee and P. Majumdar, *Pramana* **63** (2004) 851-858; arXiv: gr-qc/0402061 14, 15, 21

[24] A. Chatterjee and P. Majumdar, *Black hole entropy: quantum vs thermal fluctuations*; arXiv: gr-qc/0303030 14, 15, 21

[25] P. Majumdar, *Thermal stability of radiant black holes*; arXiv: gr-qc/0604026 14, 15, 21

[26] A. Chatterjee and P. Majumdar, *Phys. Rev.* **D72** (2005) 044005; arXiv: gr-qc/0504064 14, 15, 21

[27] P. Majumdar, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 1747; arXiv: gr-qc/0701014 14, 15, 21

[28] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifschitz, *Statistical Physics*, Pergamon Press, 1980; D' ter Haar, *Elements of Statistical Mechanics*, 3rd Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1995; R. K. Pathria and P. D. Beale, *Statistical Mechanics*, 3rd Edition, Elsevier, 2011 6, 7, 14

[29] K. V. Krasnov, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **30** (1998) 53-68; arXiv:gr-qc/9605047v3 6

[30] A.Ghosh and A.Perez, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, (2011) 241301; arXiv:1107.1320v2 8, 16, 18, 20, 21

[31] A. Majhi, *A Model Hamiltonian for Quantum Isolated Horizon* 12

[32] E. Bianchi, *Entropy of Non-Extremal Black Holes from Loop Gravity*; arXiv:1204.5122 18, 21

[33] E. Bianchi and W. Wieland, *Horizon energy as the boost boundary term in general relativity and loop gravity*; arXiv:1205.5325 18, 21

[34] A. Majhi, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **30** (2013) 055020; arXiv:1112.3457 18

[35] C. Roeken, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **30** (2013) 015005; arXiv:1207.4689v3 21

[36] C. Rovelli and L. Smolin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B442** (1995) 593, *Erratum-ibid.* **B456** (1995) 753; arXiv:gr-qc/9411005v1 21

[37] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14** (1997) A55-A82; arXiv:gr-qc/9602046v2 21

[38] A. Ashtekar and J. Lewandowski, *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **1** (1998) 388; arXiv:gr-qc/9711031v1 21

[39] T. Thiemann, *J. Math. Phys.* **39** (1998) 3347; arXiv:gr-qc/9606091v1 21

[40] T. Thiemann, *J. Math. Phys.* **39** (1998) 3372-3392; arXiv:gr-qc/9606092v1 21

[41] E. Frodden, A. Ghosh and A. Perez, *A local first law for black hole thermodynamics*, arXiv:1110.4055v2 21

[42] L. Smolin, *General relativity as the equation of state of spin foam*, arXiv:1205.5529v1 21